

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action dated March 13, 2003. Claims 69-74 are currently pending in this application, and of these only claim 69 is independent. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 69 and 71-74 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,168,737 (Poco). Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's statement that claim 70 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and intervening claims.

The Examiner acknowledges that Poco does not teach all limitations of claim 69. Specifically, the Examiner states that "Poco does not explicitly disclose that the positive mold is formed by depositing a layer of photoresist". However, the Examiner goes on to argue that this limitation, and thus claim 69, would be obvious in view of Poco. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states: "using a photoresist layer to form a positive mold is common and known in the art". However, Examiner does not cite any prior art references to support this proposition. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner and respectfully requests the Examiner to either cite a reference to support the proposition (i.e., that : "using a photoresist layer to form a positive mold is common and known in the art") or withdraw the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the art of mold making is separate and distinct from the art of photolithography, in which photoresist is used. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that using photoresist to form a positive mold is not common or known in the art, and that further, one skilled in the art of mold making would NOT have been motivated to look to the art of photolithography to improve known methods for making molds. For at least these reasons, independent claim 69 is believed to patentably distinguish the art of record.

Claims 69-74, the claims remaining in the application, are believed to define allowable subject matter. An early and favorable examination is earnestly solicited. If there are any remaining issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/560,260
Response Dated June 13, 2003

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, please charge any fees, or credit any overpayment, that may be due in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

JUN 13, 2003

Date

Respectfully submitted,



...

...

Richard A. Goldenberg
Reg. No. 38,895
Attorney for Applicant

Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6548